FAX NO. 4359865723

P. 02/14 PAGE 03/08

WALTER F. BUGDEN, JR. (480) TARA L. ISAACSON (7555) BUGDEN & ISAACSON, L.L.C. 445 East 200 South, Suite 150 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Telephone: (801) 467-1700 Facsimile: (801) 746-8600

RICHARD A. WRIGHT (Nevada Bar No. 886) WRIGHT, JUDD & WINCKLER Bank of America Plaza 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 701 Las Vegas, NV 89101

Telephone: (702) 382-4004 Facsimile: (702) 382-4800

Attorneys for Defendant

2007 FFF 12 PH 12: 16

Ordered Fil

IN THE FIFTH DISTRICT COURT WASHINGTON COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

STATE OF UTAH,

Plaintiff.

۷\$,

WARREN STEED JEFFS.

Defendant,

DEFENDANT'S REPLY TO STATE'S
OBJECTION TO AND REQUEST FOR
CLARIFICATION RE
PROPOSED ORDER ALLOWING
CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED
CONTACT WITH PATIENT
[Filed Under Seal]

Case No. 061500526

Judge James L. Shumate

The Defendant, Warren Jeffs, by and through counsel, hereby replies to the State's objection and request for clarification. The Defendant does not believe that the proposed Order exceeds the request filed by the Defendant contained in the Defendant's Motion for Confidential and Privileged Physician Contact with Patient. The

undersigned counsel attempted to prepare an Order that was entirely consistent with this Court's oral ruling. To the extend that the proposed Order is an accurate in any regard, the Defendant will be happy to modify the Order.

DEFENDANT'S PRESENCE AT THE HEARING

An expedited hearing to address the Defendant's request to obtain a second opinion concerning the Defendant's health does not constitute a critical stage of the criminal proceeding. Critical stages of a criminal proceeding include arraignment, preliminary hearing, trial and sentencing. See Hamilton v. Alabama, 368 U.S. 52, 55 (1981) (holding that arraignment is a critical stage where the right to counsel cannot be infringed); White v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 52, 60 (1963) (per curium) (determining that preliminary hearing is a critical stage where right to counsel cannot be infringed); Wagstaff v. Bames, 802 P.2d 774, 779 (Utah Ct. App. 1990) (holding that trial is a critical stage where defendant has right to counsel even if defendant himself is not present); State v. Curry, 147 P.3d 483 (Ut. Ct. App. 2006). Litigating the issue of whether the defendant and his counsel are entitled to obtain a second opinion on the defendant's medical diagnosis, treatment, and access to medical records is simply not a critical stage of the proceedings and the defendant's personal presence during the expedited hearing was not necessary.

Should the Court conclude that discussions concerning obtaining a second opinion on medical diagnosis, treatment, and disbursement of medical records constitutes a critical stage of the proceeding, the undersigned counsel hereby waive the defendant's right to be present during the discussion on these issues. There is no

compelling reason why defendant's counsel cannot waive the defendant's presence from a discussion on these issues.

HIPPA

The reference to HIPPA was mentioned by the undersigned counsel during the oral argument in passing. The Defendant acknowledges that neither party briefed any issues related to HIPPA. Ultimately, the undersigned counsel included a reference to HIPPA merely because the Court mentioned HIPPA in announcing its ruling. The undersigned counsel would be happy to delete any reference to HIPPA to satisfy the State's objection or if this Court believes the HIPPA reference should be deleted.

As to access to medical records, the Defendant has executed a medical release authorizing the Purgatory Correctional Facility to release all of the Defendant's medical records to his defense counsel. A copy of the release is attached hereto.

Additionally, co-counsel of the Defendant, Richard Wright, has specifically discussed this issue with the Defendant who has agreed that defense counsel should be entitled and have access to the Defendant's medical records.

CONSENT IN GENERAL

The Defendant has advised Richard Wright that he is willing to meet with Dr. Lloyd Barlow, Dr. Thomas Bittker, and Dr. Claude Warner. The release of the medical records to defense counsel includes allowing defense counsel to share those records with the enumerated physicians.

REFUSAL OF CONSENT

Should the Defendant not wish to be examined by the proposed physicians, then the Purgatory Correctional Facility should not be required to compel the Defendant to see the proposed physicians over the Defendant's objection.

CONSULT WITH ENTIRE HOSPITAL / MEDICAL STAFE

The language objected to by the State was included merely because Mr. Beinap requested this clarification and the Court made reference to contact from doctors on down to nurses. Nonetheless, the Defendant is happy to agree that all requests for consultation be limited to Dr. LaRowe.

CONCLUSION

Discussions about obtaining a second opinion on medical diagnosis, treatment and dissemination of medical records is not a critical stage of the proceeding. The Defendant has signed a medical release authorizing Purgatory Correctional Facility to disclose all medical records to defense counsel. Any reference to HIPPA can be deleted from the Order. PCF should not be required to compel the Defendant to meet with Dr. Barlow, Bittker, or Warner against his wishes. And finally, the Defendant agrees that all consultation between the consulting physicians can be channeled through Dr. LaRowe.

DATED this Aday of February, 2007,

BUGDEN & ISAACSON, L.L.C.

WALTER F. BUGDEN, JR. TARA L. ISAACSON

Attorneys for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on the day of February, 2007, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing by the method indicated below, and addressed to the following:

Brock R. Belnap Washington County Attorney 178 North 200 East St. George, UT 84770





TOTAL P. 02